

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FII	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/428,453	10/28/1999		SATORU MOTOHASHI	35.C13980	4676
5514	7590	05/07/2004		EXAMINER	
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA				RODEE, CHRISTOPHER D	
NEW YORK, NY 10112				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1756	

DATE MAILED: 05/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

MOTOHASHI ET AL.	MOTOHASHI ET AL.		
Art Unit			
1756			
	Art Unit		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 20 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]	
 a)	r. In
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extens fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extens fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.	
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:	
(a) 🔯 they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) X they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or	e
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendmen canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	it
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the reasons given in "2" above.	
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.	
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	
Claim(s) allowed:	
Claim(s) objected to:	
Claim(s) rejected: <u>15, 22, 26, 27, 29, 30, 33</u> .	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	
10. ☐ Other:	
CHRISTOPHER RODEE PRIMARY EXAMINER	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-303 (Rev. 04-01) Continuation of 2. NOTE: the proposed amendment would require further search and consideration because the unbounded upper limit for the second polycarbonate resins viscosity-average molecular weight has not been previously considered. As discussed in the last Office action, the second polycarbonate resin has a viscosity-average molecular weight of 20,000. The passage cited by applicant does not, upon careful consideration, show that the resin having the moleuclar weight of a "certain value" of higher is the same second polycarbonate resin of the instant claims. The amendment raises the issue of new matter because the unbounded upper range is not apparently supported by the spcification as filed .